Perfect Function Transfer in two- and three- dimensions without initialization

Lian-Ao Wu,[1,2] Mark Byrd,[3,4] Z.-D. Wang,[5] and Bin Shao[6]

[1]*Department of Theoretical Physics and History of Science, The Basque Country University (EHU/UPV), PO Box 644, 48080 Bilbao, Spain*
[2]*IKERBASQUE, Basque Foundation for Science, 48011 Bilbao, Spain*
[3]*Physics Department, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, Illinois 62901-4401*
[4]*Computer Science Department, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, Illinois 62901*
[5]*Department of Physics and Center of Theoretical and Computational Physics, University of Hong Kong, Pokfulam Road, Hong Kong, China*
[6]*Department of Physics, Beijing Institute of Technology, Beijing, 100081*

(Dated: April 2, 2010)

We find analytic models that can perfectly transfer, without state initialization or remote collaboration, arbitrary functions in two- and three-dimensional interacting bosonic and fermionic networks. We elaborate on a possible implementation of state transfer through bosonic or fermionic atoms trapped in optical lattices. A significant finding is that the state of a spin qubit can be perfectly transferred through a fermionic system. Families of Hamiltonians, both linear and nonlinear, are described which are related to the linear Boson model and that enable the perfect transfer of arbitrary functions. This includes entangled states such as decoherence-free subsystems enabling noise protection of the transferred state.

PACS numbers: 05.40.-a,02.50.-r,87.15.-v,87.10.+e

arXiv:1004.0010v1 [quant-ph] 31 Mar 2010

Introduction.— The study of the transfer of a quantum state using *naturally-available* interactions in a spin chain dates back to Bose's work [1]. The motivation is to enable transfer over short distances within a quantum information processing system. However in most realistic cases it failed to perfectly perform such a transfer. In 2004, Chirstandl *et al.* [2] found that perfect state transfer (PST) is possible in spin-1/2 networks if parameters in the system's Hamiltonian is carefully engineered. Since that time, several general results have been obtained for state transfer. For example, the fidelity can made arbitrarily large if there is no limit to the number of sequential gates that can be applied [3]. The communication can also be improved if the sender encodes the message state over a set of multiple spins [4–7], and ideal state transmissions have also been proposed using quantum dots [8, 9]. (See also the review [10] and references therein.) The possibility of perfect transfer triggered some general results ([10], and references therein), [11] and interest in finding pre-engineered models that analytically demonstrate perfect state transfer, for example, refs. [12] and [13].

The strategy for PST in Ref. [2, 14] is to map indices of the number of sites of a spin chain onto the magnetic quantum numbers of an angular momentum operator. The nearest-neighbor interaction thus becomes the x-component of a quasi-angular momentum. It was recently pointed out that the nearest-neighbor interaction can correspond to either the bosonic or spinless fermionic representations of quasi-angular momenta operators in one dimension [15]. As with any analytical solvable model in physics, the simplicity and beauty of the result clarifies the physical picture and this one provides *the example* of " perfect state transfer." On the other hand, it is obvious that the one-dimensional state transfer surely cannot be the end of the story of state transmissions. This prompts the following question, can the strategy in Ref. [2] be applied to the two- and three-dimensional cases? Here, we propose an analytical solution to the problem of perfectly transferring an unknown function (termed perfect function transfer or PFT) with one or more variables from a processor at one site to another processor at another site in systems which are *two-* or *three-*dimensional. The interaction required for perfect state transfer in our model can be implemented using the Bose-Hubbard model (see, e.g., [16] and references therein) or fermions in an optical lattice [17]. In these systems there is a *family of Hamiltonians that can perform PFT*, obtained via the so-called *dressing* transformations.

Linear Bose model.— Consider the dynamics of cold bosonic atoms loaded in a two-dimensional square optical lattice with N sites along the horizontal direction and M site along vertical direction governed by the general linear nearest-neighbor Bose model Hamiltonian [16, 18–20]:

$$H = -\sum_{j=1}^{M-1}\sum_{k=1}^{N-1}[J_{jk}^{(1)}b_{j,k}^{\dagger}b_{j+1,k} + J_{jk}^{(2)}b_{j,k}^{\dagger}b_{j,k+1} + \text{h.c.}], \tag{1}$$

where $b_{j,k}^{\dagger}$ ($b_{j,k}$) is the bosonic creation (annihilation) operator at the two-dimensional site (j,k). Equation (1) describes hopping bosons in the absence of on-site repulsion. The hopping (or tunneling) matrix element along the horizontal and vertical directions between nearest-neighbor sites may be given by

$$J_{jk}^{(1)} = \int d^3\vec{r}\, w^*(\vec{r}-\vec{r}_{j,k})[T + V_{\text{lat}}(\vec{r})]w(\vec{r}-\vec{r}_{j+1,k}), \tag{2}$$

$$J_{jk}^{(2)} = \int d^3\vec{r}\, w^*(\vec{r}-\vec{r}_{j,k})[T + V_{\text{lat}}(\vec{r})]w(\vec{r}-\vec{r}_{j,k+1}), \tag{3}$$

where $w(\vec{r}-\vec{r}_{j,k})$ is a single atom Wannier function at lattice site (j,k), $V_{\text{lat}}(\vec{r})$ denotes the optical lattice potential, and T is the kinetic energy of a single atom.

We will consider the limit when the on-site repulsion is neglectably small or the cases with total boson number being

one. The Hamiltonian in Eq. (1) is also equivalent to that of the on-chip coupled cavities (e.g., in Refs. [21, 22]). The tunable coupling J_{jk} between each pair of resonators can be realized by SQUID couplers (e.g., Ref. [23]).

Angular momentum and engineered linear Bose model.— By generalizing Ref. [2] the indices of the number of sites of a two-dimensional lattice can be mapped into the magnetic quantum numbers of the two total angular momenta l_1, l_2 such that $l_1 = \frac{M-1}{2}, l_2 = \frac{N-1}{2}$ and $m_1 = -\frac{M+1}{2} + j, m_2 = -\frac{N+1}{2} + k$. For instance, the magnetic numbers for the first site are $(-\frac{M-1}{2}, -\frac{N-1}{2})$.

With this mapping, the bosonic operator (or spinless fermionic operator) $b^\dagger_{j,k}$ at site $j = m_1 + \frac{M+1}{2}$ and $k = m_2 + \frac{N+1}{2}$ corresponds to the $SU_1(2) \times SU_2(2)$ irreducible spherical tensor bosonic operator $A^\dagger_{l_1 m_1, l_2 m_2}$, or in a shorthand notation $A^\dagger_{m_1,m_2}$. The three components of the horizontal (vertical) quasi-angular momentum vector $\vec{L}^{(1)}$ ($\vec{L}^{(2)}$) can be expressed in terms of the atomic creation and annihilation operators as

$$\begin{aligned}
L^{(1)}_x &= \sum_{jk} C^{(1)}_j (b^\dagger_{j,k} b_{j+1,k} + b^\dagger_{j+1,k} b_{j,k}), \\
L^{(2)}_x &= \sum_{ik} C^{(2)}_k (b^\dagger_{j,k} b_{j,k+1} + b^\dagger_{j,k+1} b_{j,k}), \qquad (4) \\
L^{(1)}_y &= i \sum_{jk} C^{(1)}_j (b^\dagger_{j,k} b_{j+1,k} - b^\dagger_{j+1,k} b_{j,k}), \\
L^{(2)}_y &= i \sum_{ik} C^{(2)}_k (b^\dagger_{j,k} b_{j,k+1} - b^\dagger_{j,k+1} b_{j,k}), \qquad (5) \\
L^{(1)}_z &= \sum n_{j,k} \left[j - \frac{1}{2}(M+1) \right], \qquad (6) \\
L^{(2)}_z &= \sum n_{j,k} \left[k - \frac{1}{2}(N+1) \right] \qquad (7)
\end{aligned}$$

where $C^{(1)}_j = \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{j(M-j)}$ and $C^{(2)}_k = \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{k(N-k)}$.

For the tensor product structure of the two $SU(2)$ groups to hold, it is essential that $\vec{L}^{(1)}$ and $\vec{L}^{(2)}$, generators of the groups $SU_1(2)$ and $SU_2(2)$ commute. It is not obvious, but $[\vec{L}^{(1)}, \vec{L}^{(2)}] = 0$ *does* hold for bosons *and* fermions. (Fermions will be discussed later.) This can be seen by directly calculating the commutators of different components. However, unlike in one dimension, the Jordon-Wigner transformation cannot be used to directly replace a fermionic operator by corresponding Pauli matrices $\sigma^+_{j,k}$. If the $b^\dagger_{j,k} \Leftrightarrow \sigma^+_{j,k}$ in (1), then the corresponding $\vec{L}^{(1)}$ and $\vec{L}^{(2)}$ will not commute.

Supposing that the $J_{j,k}$ are pre-engineered in Eq. (1) as in Ref. [2] such that $J^{(1)}_{j,k} = J^{(1)} C^{(1)}_j$ and $J^{(2)}_{j,k} = J^{(2)} C^{(2)}_k$, then the time evolution becomes

$$U(t) = \exp[i(J^{(1)} L^{(1)}_x + J^{(2)} L^{(2)}_x)t]. \qquad (8)$$

Note that the parameters $J^{(1)}_{j,k} = J^{(1)} C^{(1)}_j$ are constructed such that they are independent of k.

The irreducible tensor operator $A^\dagger_{m_1,m_2}$ in the Heisenberg representation evolves as

$$\begin{aligned}
U^\dagger(t) A^\dagger_{m_1,m_2} U(t) &= \sum e^{i\frac{\pi}{2}(m'_1 - m_1)} d^{l_1}_{m'_1 m_1}(J^{(1)}t) \qquad (9) \\
&\quad \times e^{i\frac{\pi}{2}(m'_2 - m_2)} d^{l_2}_{m'_2 m_2}(J^{(2)}t) A^\dagger_{m'_1,m'_2} \qquad (10)
\end{aligned}$$

where $d^l_{m'm}$ is the small Wigner D-function. When $J^{(1)} = J^{(2)} = J$ and $t_0 = \pi/J$, this expression reduces to a simple form:

$$U^\dagger(t_0)\, b^\dagger_{j,k}\, U(t_0) = r_1 r_2 b^\dagger_{M-j+1,N-k+1}\,, \qquad (11)$$

where the factors $r_1 = \exp\left(-i\pi\frac{M-1}{2}\right)$ and $r_2 = \exp\left(-i\pi\frac{N-1}{2}\right)$ are analogous to the *signature* in nuclear structure theory [24]. These factors determine the interference of quantum states traversing the chain and depend on the number of lattice sites [15]. Choosing the number of sites appropriately can produce interference such that $r_1 r_2 = 1$. Along with the two directions after t_0, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
e^{iL^{(1)}_x \pi} b^\dagger_{j,k} e^{-iL^{(1)}_x \pi} &= r_1 b^\dagger_{M-j+1,k} \\
e^{iL^{(2)}_x \pi} b^\dagger_{j,k} e^{-iL^{(2)}_x \pi} &= r_2 b^\dagger_{j,N-k+1}
\end{aligned}$$

which reduces the problem to one-dimensional chains.

Perfect state transfer.— Let us first consider the case of a bosonic system which can be applied to various linear optical or atomic systems. Suppose that a known or unknown function f is encoded in the bottom-left site $(1,1)$, such that $f(x)$ is mapped to the state $f(b^\dagger_{1,1})|\mathbf{0}\rangle$, where $|\mathbf{0}\rangle = |0\rangle^{\otimes N}$. Thus, a general function can be perfectly transferred to the top-right (M,N) by

$$U(t_0) f(b^\dagger_{1,1})|\mathbf{0}\rangle = f(b^\dagger_{M,N})|\mathbf{0}\rangle. \qquad (12)$$

We emphasize that the central sites, other than $(1,1)$ and (M,N), of the two-dimensional network are not necessarily in the ground state and can be in an arbitrary state $g(b^\dagger_{j,k})|\mathbf{0}\rangle$ such that initialization is not needed as in [12]. However, for simplicity and without loss of generality, we will assume the system is in the state $|\mathbf{0}\rangle$.

The Hamiltonian (1) does not include the on-site repulsion $H_U = \sum n_{j,k}(n_{j,k} - 1)$. When the interaction is relatively strong and/or the total boson umber $\sum n_{j,k}$ is much smaller than the number of lattice sites, the system tends to have at most one atom at each site due to the energy gap from H_U and when there is only one particle, a function can be transferred perfectly. In this case, an arbitrary state $|\phi\rangle$ of the whole system can be annihilated by the on-site repulsion Hamiltonian $H_U|\phi\rangle = 0$. Therefore, this case is equivalent to the one in Eq. (12) and the transfer will be perfect if we are able to prepare an initial state $|\phi\rangle_{1,1} = \alpha|\mathbf{0}\rangle + \beta b^\dagger_{1,1}|\mathbf{0}\rangle$, where only the first site is occupied. Thus, the state can be perfectly transferred to $|\phi\rangle_{M,N} = \alpha|\mathbf{0}\rangle + \beta b^\dagger_{M,N}|\mathbf{0}\rangle$ as is done in the linear case. Note that the result is also applicable to the case where $f(x_{j,k})$ is a multivariable function, where j and k each range over some number of sites.

Perfect state transfer of spin qubits between sites.— While the above results are directly applicable to so-called spinless fermions $c^\dagger_{j,k}$, by replacement $b^\dagger_{j,k} \Leftrightarrow c^\dagger_{j,k}$, they can be generalized to realistic cold fermionic atoms $c^\dagger_{j,k,\sigma}$ (or a spherical tensor $A^\dagger_{l_1 m_1, l_2 m_2, s\sigma}$) at site (j,k) with a total spin s and components σ. Here we consider the example of $s = 1/2$. One can engineer a spin-independent Hamiltonian similar to Eq. (1) with quasi-angular momenta in two directions,

$$\begin{aligned} L_x^{(1)} &= \sum_{jk\sigma} C_j^{(1)} (c^\dagger_{j,k,\sigma} c_{j+1,k,\sigma} + c^\dagger_{j+1,k,\sigma} c_{j,k,\sigma}) \\ L_x^{(2)} &= \sum_{ik\sigma} C_k^{(2)} (c^\dagger_{j,k,\sigma} c_{j,k+1,\sigma} + c^\dagger_{j,k+1,\sigma} c_{j,k,\sigma}) \end{aligned}$$

where the sum is over up and down spins, $\sigma = \downarrow, \uparrow$. The same construction applies to other components of the angular momenta. The most general state that can be prepared at site $(1,1)$ is $|\phi\rangle_{1,1} = (\alpha + \beta c^\dagger_{1,1,\uparrow} + \gamma c^\dagger_{1,1,\downarrow} + \delta c^\dagger_{1,1,\uparrow} c^\dagger_{1,1,\downarrow}) |\mathbf{0}\rangle$. This state can be transferred perfectly using $U(t_0) |\phi\rangle_{1,1} = |\phi\rangle_{M,N}$. We can also define the spin operators at a given site in terms of the Pauli matrices $\vec{\sigma} = (X, Y, Z)$, $\vec{S}_{jk} = \sum_{\sigma\sigma'} \langle\sigma'| \frac{\vec{\sigma}}{2} |\sigma\rangle c^\dagger_{j,k,\sigma'} c_{j,k,\sigma}$. The total spin operator is then

$$\vec{S} = \sum_{jk} \vec{S}_{jk} \tag{13}$$

which commutes with the quasi-angular momenta $\vec{L}^{(1)}$ and $\vec{L}^{(2)}$ and can generate an arbitrary gate on $|\phi\rangle_{1,1}$.

The two possible directions of the spin, $\pm 1/2$ can also represent a spin qubit at site (j,k) when the spin is an electron spin in two-dimensional quantum dot [25] or when it is associated with the two states of fermionic atoms in an optical lattice [26, 27]. The states of the qubit are defined by $|0\rangle_{j,k} = c^\dagger_{j,k,\uparrow}|\mathbf{0}\rangle$ and $|1\rangle_{j,k} = c^\dagger_{j,k,\downarrow}|\mathbf{0}\rangle$. An arbitrary state $|\psi\rangle_{j,k} = \beta |0\rangle_{j,k} + \gamma |1\rangle_{j,k}$ of this qubit can be perfectly transferred to $|\psi\rangle_{M-j+1,N-k+1}$ by $U(t_0)$. Any generator $\vec{S}$ can be obtained this way so that any rotation to the state can be constructed. (See the analogue in Eq. (10).) Also, with the same method an entangled state in several sites can be transferred perfectly. For example, an entangled state $\beta |0\rangle_{1,1} |0\rangle_{1,2} + \gamma |1\rangle_{1,1} |1\rangle_{1,2}$ is transferred to $\beta |0\rangle_{M,N} |0\rangle_{M,N-1} + \gamma |1\rangle_{M,N} |1\rangle_{M,N-1}$ after time t_0. It should be emphasized that since the possibility of perfect state transfer in a spin network of higher dimension remains unclear, the perfect transfer via fermionic network (or media) is a promising solution when transferring spin qubits in higher dimensions.

Generalization.— An arbitrary time-independent unitary transformation W does not change the commutation relations among angular momentum components if it corresponds to a similarity transformation in the Heisenberg picture. Indeed, the whole family of Hamiltonians generated by an arbitrary W can transfer functions perfectly. However, this map can introduce new effects. For a spin system, this transformation W corresponds to the so-called *dressed qubit* [28]. The bosonic Hilbert space is infinite-dimensional and thus allows more flexibility for transformations, including continuous-variable transformations (which is not possible in spin chains).

As a simple example, let us first consider transformations $W = \exp(-i\theta(L_z^{(1)} + L_z^{(2)}))$. Under the dressing transformation, the Hamiltonian $H_l = J(L_x^{(1)} + L_x^{(2)})$ becomes

$$H' = WHW^\dagger = \cos\theta H + \sin\theta J(L_y^{(1)} + L_y^{(2)})$$

The *dressed state* $|\theta\rangle = W|\mathbf{0}\rangle$ allows perfect transfer of any function f using $U(t_0)$. The function is transferred via the coherent state $|\theta\rangle$ as:

$$\begin{aligned} & f(e^{-i(M+N+1)\theta} b^\dagger_{1,1})|\theta\rangle \\ & \quad \rightarrow \ f(e^{-i(M+N+1)\theta} b^\dagger_{M,N})|\theta\rangle. \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

Another example is a dressing transformation which entangles an individual site (j,k) and a collective bath, $W_{jk} = \exp[\lambda(b_{jk} - b^\dagger_{jk})B]$ and $W = \prod W_{jk}$, where B is an operator of the collective bath. Here λ is a small constant. Consider the effect of this transformation to first order in λ. The dressed Hamiltonian is

$$H' = W(H + H_B)W^\dagger = H + H_B + \lambda V$$

where $V = \sum_{jk}(b^\dagger_{jk} B_{jk} + b_{jk} B^\dagger_{jk})$, H_B is the bath Hamiltonian, and the operators $B_{jk} = (J_j + J_{j-1} + J_k + J_{k-1})B + [H_B, B]$. This introduces a weak system-bath interaction with a specific V via the dressing transformation. Clearly it is possible to introduce different types of interactions using different types of dressing transformations. The perfect state transfer from site $(1,1)$ to (N,M) may be roughly described by $W_{11}|\phi\rangle_{1,1} |B\rangle \longrightarrow W_{NM}|\phi\rangle_{N,M} |B\rangle$, where $|B\rangle$ is an eigenstate of the bath Hamiltonian H_B. Even when we assume the bath is in a thermal equilibrium state, as is usual, the final result is not affected.

Perfect state transfer in three dimensional cube.— In this case, a particle $b^\dagger_{j,k,n}$ (or fermion $c^\dagger_{j,k,n,\sigma}$) at site (j,k,n) is described by a spherical tensor $A^\dagger_{l_1 m_1, l_2 m_2, l_3 m_3}$. While l_1 and l_2 are the same as in the two-dimensional case, the third direction is characterized by $l_3 = \frac{K-1}{2}$ and $m_3 = -\frac{K+1}{2} + n$. The quasi angular momentum $\vec{L}^{(3)}$ in the third direction is defined analogous to those in (6), for instance, $L_x^{(3)} = \sum_{jk} C_j^{(1)} (b^\dagger_{j,k,n} b_{j,k,n+1} + b^\dagger_{j,k,n+1} b_{j,k,})$. The other components are written by replacing $b^\dagger_{j,k,n} \rightarrow b^\dagger_{j,k}$. The evolution operator is

$$U(t) = \exp[-i(J^{(1)} L_x^{(1)} + J^{(2)} L_x^{(2)} + J^{(3)} L_x^{(3)})t].$$

When $J^{(1)} = J^{(2)} = J^{(3)} = J$ and $t_0 = \pi/J$, this expression reduces to the simple form:

$$U^\dagger(t_0)\ b^\dagger_{j,k,n}\ U(t_0) = r_1 r_2 r_3 b^\dagger_{M-j+1,N-k+1}\,, \tag{15}$$

where $r_3 = \exp\left(-i\pi \frac{K-1}{2}\right)$. All results in two dimension are directly applicable to the three-dimensional, or even higher dimensional problems.

Conclusion.— We have shown that arbitrary functions can be sent perfectly (without state initialization or remote collaboration) through engineered interacting bosonic and fermionic square or cube. As an example, we have analyzed the transfer using ultra-cold bosonic atoms in optical lattices, described by the Bose-Hubbard model with properly designed site-dependent tunneling amplitudes. In a more general case, we have studied a family of linear and nonlinear Hamiltonians that enable perfect state transfers according to dressing transformations, where a certain noisy factors are considered via the type of transformations. As an important consequence, we have shown that information in spin qubits can be perfectly transferred through fermionic lattices.

The ability to send an encoded state perfectly between points, even in principle, is an important discovery. For example, one could encode in a decoherence-free subspace or subsystem to avoid errors [29–34]. (For reviews see [35, 36].) If there were imperfections, it has been shown that there exist states which can transfer quite well even if it is not a PST as discussed in the introduction. The ability cancel errors arising from a bath using the dressing transformations provides yet another useful tool. This implies, for example, that physically reasonable global transformations could be used to cancel some errors. Taken together, this work provides methods for robust transfer of an arbitrary function through two and three dimensional chains which was, until now, not known to exist. Furthermore, we have given a Hamiltonian applicable to a variety of physical systems, leading immediately to experimental proposals for testing perfect state transfer.

Acknowledgments. This work was supported by the Ikerbasque Foundation Start-up, the Spanish MEC No. FIS2009-12773-C02-02, NSF-Grant No. 0545798 to MSB and RGC grant of Hong Kong No. 7044/08P.

[1] S. Bose, Phys. Rev. Lett. **91**, 207901 (2003).
[2] M. Christandl, N. Datta, A. Ekert, and A.J. Landahl, Phys. Rev. Lett. **92**, 187902 (2004).
[3] D. Burgarth, V. Giovannetti, S. Bose, Phys. Rev. A **75**, 062327 (2007).
[4] H.L. Haselgrove, Phys. Rev. A **72**, 062326 (2005).
[5] Z.-M. Wang, C. Allen Bishop, M. S. Byrd, B. Shao, J. Zou, Phys. Rev. A **80**, 022330 (2009).
[6] J. Allcock and N. Linden, Phys. Rev. Lett. **102**, 110501 (2009).
[7] T. J. Osborne, N. Linden, Phys. Rev. A **69**, 052315 (2004).
[8] G. M. Nikolopoulos, D. Petrosyan and P. Lambropoulos, Europhys. Lett. **65**, 297 (2004).
[9] G.M. Nikolopoulos, D. Petrosyan, P. Lambropoulos, J. Phys: Cond. Mat. **16**, 4991 (2004).
[10] S. Bose, Contemp. Phys. **48**, 13 (2007).
[11] L.-A. Wu, Y.-X. Liu, and F. Nori, Phys. Rev. A **80**, 042315 (2009).
[12] C. Di Franco, M. Paternostro and M.S. Kim, Phys. Rev. Lett. **101**, 230502 (2009).
[13] S. Yang, Z. Song, and C. P. Sun, quant-ph/051094.
[14] M. Christandl, N. Datta, T.C. Dorlas, A. Ekert, A. Kay, and A.J. Landahl, Phys. Rev. A **71**, 032312 (2005).
[15] L.-A. Wu, A. Miranowicz, X. B. Wang, Y.-x. Liu, and F. Nori, Phys. Rev. A **80**, 012332 (2009).
[16] C. Bruder, R. Fazio, and G. Schön, Ann. Physik **14**, 566 (2005).
[17] L.-M. Duan, Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 243202 (2005).
[18] D. Jaksch, C. Bruder, J. I. Cirac, C. W. Gardiner, and P. Zoller, Phys. Rev. Lett. **81**, 3108 (1998).
[19] J. Reslen and S. Bose (2008), arXiv:0812.0303.
[20] M. Greiner, O. Mandel, T. Esslinger, T. W. Hnsch and I. Bloch, Nature **415**, 39 (2002).
[21] M.J. Hartmann, F.G. Brandao and M.B. Plenio, Nat. Phys. **2**, 849 (2006).
[22] K. Y. Bliokh, Y. P. Bliokh, V. Freilikher, S. Savel'ev, and F. Nori, Rev. Mod. Phys. **80**, 1201 (2008).
[23] M. Sandberg, C. M. Wilson, F. Persson, T. Bauch, G. Johansson, V. Shumeiko, T. Duty, and P. Delsing, Appl. Phys. Lett. **92**, 203501 (2008).
[24] P. Ring and P. Schuck, *The Nuclear Many-body Problem* (Springer, New York, 1980).
[25] D. Loss and D.P. DiVincenzo, Phys. Rev. A **57**, 120 (1998).
[26] G.K. Brennen, C.M. Caves, P.S. Jessen and I.H. Deutsch, Phys. Rev. Lett. **82**, 1060 (1999).
[27] A. Sørensen and K. Mølmer, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 2274 (1999).
[28] L.-A. Wu, D.A. Lidar, Phys. Rev. Lett. **91**, 097904 (2003).
[29] P. Zanardi and M. Rasetti, Phys. Rev. Lett. **79**, 3306 (1997).
[30] L.-M Duan and G.-C. Guo, Phys. Rev. A **57**, 737 (1998).
[31] D.A. Lidar, I.L. Chuang and K.B. Whaley, Phys. Rev. Lett. **81**, 2594 (1998).
[32] E. Knill, R. Laflamme and L. Viola, Phys. Rev. Lett. **84**, 2525 (2000).
[33] J. Kempe, D. Bacon, D.A. Lidar, and K.B. Whaley, Phys. Rev. A **63**, 042307 (2001).
[34] D.A. Lidar, D. Bacon, J. Kempe, and K.B. Whaley, Phys. Rev. A **63**, 022306 (2001).
[35] D.A. Lidar and K.B. Whaley, in *Irreversible Quantum Dynamics* (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2003).
[36] M. S. Byrd, L.-A. Wu and D. A. Lidar, J. Mod. Optics **51**, 2449 (2004).